



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee Meeting

13 December 2024

9am

Online via Zoom and

Livestreamed on Facebook

<https://www.facebook.com/WestCoastRegionalCouncil>

AGENDA

9.00am	Welcome and Apologies	Chair
9.05am	Report – Submission on TTPP Variation 2 – Coastal Hazards	Project Manager
9.20am	In Committee Report – Contract Variations	Project Manager
9.30am	Meeting ends	

Meeting dates for 2025

16 January (online)	9-9.30am
25 February	9-11am
28 March	9-11am
10 April	9-4pm
21 May	9-4pm
18 June	9-4pm
22 July	9-4pm
23 July	9-4pm
12 August	9-4pm
14 August	9-4pm
11 September	1.30-3.30pm
19 November	1.30-3.30pm
11 December	1.30-3.30pm



Te Tai o Poutini PLAN

A combined district plan for the West Coast

Prepared for: Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

Prepared by: Jo Armstrong

Date: 13 December 2024

Subject: Submission on Te Tai o Poutini Plan Variation 2 – Coastal Hazards

Overview

1. TTPP Committee have requested that staff improve the useability of the plan where opportunities arise to do so.
2. In order to make any changes to the notified version of TTPP, there must be a submission requesting such a change.
3. This paper presents a submission on TTPP Variation 2 -Coastal Hazards for the Committee to consider for approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. That the Committee receives this report
2. That the Committee approves the submission on TTPP Variation 2 – Coastal Hazards and directs staff to lodge the submission on their behalf prior to 5pm on 19 December 2024.

Jo Armstrong

Project Manager

BACKGROUND

4. TTPP Committee have requested that staff improve the useability of TTPP.
5. The hearings process on the proposed TTPP provides the opportunity to make changes to the Plan through submissions received, and recommendations made by the Hearings Panel.
6. The Hearings Panel can only make recommendations for changes as requested by submitters, other changes are deemed out of scope.
7. The current Natural Hazards objectives and policies (known collectively as the provisions) cover all natural hazard overlays in the Plan. There have already been TTPP hearings for every other natural hazard in the Plan except for the Coastal Hazards.
8. The reporting planner has recommended changes to these provisions which will improve understanding and also better align them with the requirements of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS).
9. Variation 2 is not being heard until mid-March 2025 and staff have identified some areas in which the provisions for Coastal Hazards could be improved.
10. One improvement would be to separate the objectives and policies for coastal hazards out from the general natural hazard provisions, and also align them with planner recommendations already made for other hazards, including alignment with the NZCPS.
11. Separating the provisions out for Coastal Hazards will enable more tailored objectives and policies to be developed for these overlays.
12. Staff have prepared the submission on Variation 2 – Coastal Hazards for the Committee, and request approval to lodge it to ensure the Hearings Panel has the scope to recommend these changes.

Recommended Submission Content

Submission on Te Tai o Poutini Plan – Variation 2

From Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee

1. Introduction

This submission comes from the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee. It focuses on matters that are:

1. Recommendations on the provisions providing to Variation 2 to ensure consistency with the recommendations made on the natural hazards provisions; and
2. To ensure alignment of the provisions with the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.
3. Changes to the naming convention of the coastal hazard overlays

It is noted that there are some matters that the individual Councils (Westland District Council, Grey District Council, Buller District Council and West Coast Regional Council) and Poutini Ngāi Tahu may also submit on. These have not been discussed with or endorsed by the Te Tai o Poutini Plan Committee. This document is its sole submission.

2. Submission

2.1.1 Recommended Changes to the provisions to align with the recommendations on the natural hazards chapter.

2.1.2 Within the natural hazards hearing topic, the terms Hazard Sensitive, Potentially Hazard Sensitive and Less Hazard Sensitive Activities were introduced. These terms describe different land use activities and for the purposes of consistency it is requested that these same terms are used in the coastal hazard policies and rules.

Relief Sought

Where the Proposed District Plan references terms such as residential, commercial, industrial, non-habitable in relation to coastal hazards, replace these with the terms Hazard Sensitive, Potentially Hazard Sensitive and Less Hazard Sensitive Activities

- 2.1.3 To assist plan users, it is recommended that where District Plan provisions relate to coastal hazards, the term natural hazards, is replaced with the term coastal hazards. This is to assist plan users with understanding what provisions relate to natural hazards and what provisions relate to coastal hazards.

Relief sought

Where District Plan provisions relate to coastal hazards, the term natural hazards, is replaced with the term coastal hazards.

- 2.1.4 As part of the natural hazard hearing topic, a number of recommendations were made to change the objectives. It is recommended that Coastal Hazards have similar objectives. These revised objectives would improve the usability of the District Plan to plan users as it provides clear directive on how development needs to be managed in respect to each overlay. The suggested wording for each of the proposed Coastal Hazard objectives is as follows:

Relief sought

Introduce Objectives to address coastal hazards with the following or similar wording.

CH-01 - Subdivision, use and development within the Severe Natural Hazard Overlays reduces or does not increase the existing risk from natural hazards to people, buildings, and regionally significant infrastructure.

CH – 02 - Subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Alert and Coastal Setback Overlays minimises the risk from coastal hazards to people, buildings and regionally significant infrastructure

- 2.1.5 Under the proposed District Plan, the Coastal Severe Overlay is located within NH-Policy 10. It is submitted that given the direction under the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, the Coastal Severe Overlay is removed from this policy and has its own standalone policy that gives better effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, in that it recognises that the risk in this overlay does not increase. The suggested wording for this policy is as follows:

Relief sought

Introduce a new policy to address subdivision, use and development within the Coastal Severe Overlay. The suggested wording is as follows:.

Avoid subdivision, use and development for Hazard Sensitive Activities in the Coastal Severe Overlay unless:

a. For activities that have an operational or functional need to locate or occur within the Coastal Severe Overlay and locating or occurring outside these areas is not a practicable option:

i. Mitigation measures are incorporated to minimise the risk of damage to buildings and loss of life to people associated with the activity; or

b. For any other activities:

i. The new building does not increase the risk to life when compared to the existing situation as determined by a quantified risk assessment which assesses the coastal hazard, and the nature and use of the proposed building;

- ii. The new building incorporates measures that avoid increasing the existing risk to the building from the coastal hazard;
- iii. The new development does not involve or require the removal or modification of a natural system or feature that provides protection to other properties from the natural hazard.

2.1.6 The rule framework sets a discretionary activity status for both additions and new buildings that contain hazard sensitive activities in the coastal alert overlay. It is considered that this activity status is too restrictive and could be changed to the restricted discretionary activity.

Relief sought

Change the rule framework for both additions and new buildings that contain hazard sensitive activities in the coastal alert overlay from discretionary activity to restricted discretionary activity with the potential matter of discretion being:

- a. The risk from coastal hazards on people and property and any measures to reduce or mitigate this risk;
- b. The management of vegetation or other natural features to mitigate natural hazard risk;
- c. The potential for there to be an increase in the risk of coastal erosion to neighbouring properties from either the design of the proposed development or any mitigation measures to reduce the risk to future occupants or buildings.
- e. Any potential impacts on the natural environment or changes in natural processes as a result of any natural hazard mitigation measures use to reduce the risk to the building in the Coastal Alert Overlay.

These changes to the Matters of Discretion are a refinement of what was in the notified version of the rules pertaining to additions to Potentially Hazard Sensitive Activities and ensure that the matters of discretion are directly related to coastal hazard risks associated with the development.

2.1.7 The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement discourages hard engineering measures within the Coastal Environment. The Natural Hazards chapter currently has a permissive framework for both additions to, and new hazard engineering structures for both natural hazards and coastal hazards. Given the direction under the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, additions to, and new hard engineering structures within the coastal environment needs to be considered differently to those required for non-coastal hazards. This can be done in two ways. Either:

- The hard engineering measures for coastal hazards are addressed within the Coastal Environment chapter and not the natural hazards chapter; or
- Have a rule framework that allows for maintenance and repair of existing natural mitigation structures as upgrades that do not increase the footprint or height of the structure by more than 10% as a permitted activity. Any works that do not meet this requirement would be a discretionary activity. This would need to be supported by a policy.

Relief sought

Create a rule framework that allows for maintenance and repair of existing natural mitigation structures as upgrades that do not increase the footprint or height of the structure by more than 10% as a permitted activity. Any works that do not meet this

requirement would be a discretionary activity. This rule would need to be supported by a policy. Suggested wording would be:

Hard engineering natural hazard mitigation works

Only allow for hard engineering natural hazards mitigation works for the reduction of the risk from coastal hazards where:

- 1. The engineering measures are needed to protect existing nationally and regionally significant infrastructure and it can be demonstrated that there is no practicable alternative;*
- 2. There is a demonstrable risk to existing nationally and regionally significant infrastructure, life or private property from the coastal hazard;*
- 3. The construction of the hard engineering measures will not increase the risk from Coastal Hazards on adjacent properties that are not protected by the hard engineering measures;*
- 4. Hard engineering structures are designed to minimise adverse effects on the coastal environment*
- 5. Adverse effects on significant natural features and systems and their function as natural defences are avoided, remedied or mitigated; and*
- 6. It can be demonstrated that green infrastructure measures would not provide an appropriate level of protection in relation to the significance of the risk.*

- 2.1.8 The Coastal Setback Overlay has a rule framework for new buildings associated with Hazard Sensitive Activities. To assist plan users, there needs to be a permitted activity condition that makes it clear that less hazard sensitive activities and potentially hazard sensitive activities are permitted in this overlay.

Relief sought

Have a rule that makes it clear that new buildings containing potentially hazard sensitive activities and less hazard sensitive activities are permitted.

- 2.1.9 The Coastal Hazard Overlay naming convention uses the terms

- Coastal Severe Overlay
- Coastal Alert Overlay and
- Coastal Setback Overlay.

There has been suggestion from the community that this naming convention is not helpful and can be seen as alarmist. As such, it is sought that the name of these overlays are changed to reflect the risk or the coastal hazard process, as opposed to using terms like severe.

Relief sought

Change the naming convention of the coastal hazard overlays so that the name reflects the coastal hazard and the severity of the risk presented by the hazard.